



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,611	04/07/2005	Atsushi Nojiri	ARGM-108US	6737
23122	7590	10/31/2007		
RATNERPRESTIA P O BOX 980 VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482-0980			EXAMINER CHOWDHURY, AFROZA Y	
			ART UNIT 2629	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/31/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/530,611	Applicant(s) NOJIRI ET AL.	
	Examiner Afroza Y. Chowdhury	Art Unit 2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 16-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 16-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment received on **September 21, 2007** has been entered. Claims 2-15 are cancelled. Newly added claims are renumbered. Claims 1 and 16-19 are currently pending. Applicant's newly added claim and arguments are addressed herein below.

Claim Objections

2. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered new claims 16 and 17 have been renumbered 18 and 19.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 1 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 1, in line 8, **"each of the plurality of display apparatuses at a lower resolution upon the plurality of display apparatuses being connected the lower resolution being lower than the original resolution"** and in line 11, **"one of the plurality of display apparatuses at the original resolution upon the one of the display apparatuses being connected"** are not described in specification as originally filed.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, in line 11, **"one of the plurality of display apparatuses at the original resolution upon the one of the display apparatuses being connected"** is not clear. How does the original resolution determined by the display connection?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Yoshioka** (US Patent 6351705) in view of **Shiuan et al.** (US Pub. 2004/0075622).

As to claim 1, Yoshioka discloses a display controlling apparatus, being connectable to a plurality of display apparatuses (fig.1(2, 3), col. 3, lines 45-48), comprising:

a single video memory (fig. 1(10) for storing data at an original resolution; and
a controlling unit (fig. 1(4)) outputting the image data from said the single video memory to each of the plurality of display apparatuses (col. 3, lines 34-44).

Yoshioka does not explicitly teaches (a) each of the plurality of display apparatuses at a lower resolution upon the plurality of display apparatuses being connected the lower resolution being lower than the original resolution

(b) one of the plurality of display apparatuses at the original resolution upon the one of the display apparatuses being connected.

Shiuan et al. teaches a dual display computer system (fig. 1) where one display is running in a high-resolution mode and other display is running in a lower resolution mode (page 3, [0030], as best understood by the examiner).

Therefore, it is obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the dual display computer system of Shiuan et al. with Yoshioka's navigation system to make a display controlling apparatus where the output contents to be displayed at a desired resolution.

As to claim 18, Yoshioka (as modified by Shiuan et al.) teaches a display controlling apparatus, being connectable to a plurality of display apparatuses (fig.1(2, 3), col. 3, lines 45-48).

Yoshioka (as modified by Shiuan et al.) does not specifically teach a display controlling apparatus wherein the lower resolution depends on how many of the display apparatuses are connected.

However, it is obvious for a display controlling apparatus wherein the lower resolution depends on how many of the display apparatuses are connected.

As to claim 19, Yoshioka (as modified by Shiuan et al.) teaches a display controlling apparatus, being connectable to a plurality of display apparatuses (fig.1(2, 3), col. 3, lines 45-48).

Yoshioka (as modified by Shiuan et al.) does not a display controlling apparatus wherein the lower resolution is inversely proportional to the number of display apparatuses connected.

However, it is an obvious design choice to make a display controlling apparatus wherein the lower resolution is inversely proportional to the number of display apparatuses connected.

9. Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Chee** (US Patent 5694141) in view of **He et al.** (US Patent 6323849).

As to claim 16, Chee discloses a display controlling apparatus, in which a multiplexing unit is operative to display images by the display apparatuses.

Chee does not explicitly teach said multiplex unit is used to adjust resolution on the basis of the number of display apparatuses electrically connected to data outputting units.

He et al. teaches a display device where multiplex methodology is used to reduce power consumption while maintaining a desired resolution.

Therefore, it would be have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate display device of He et al. in Chee's display controlling apparatus in order to use a multiplexing unit to adjust resolution for displayed images of each display device.

As to claim 17, it would be obvious for a display controlling apparatus, in which a multiplexing unit is operative to adjust said resolution of each of images to be respectively displayed by the display apparatuses in inverse proportional relationship with the number of display apparatuses electrically connected to data outputting units.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed **September 21, 2007** have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the image data from the video memory in Shiuan et al. is not output to "...each of the plurality of display apparatuses at a lower resolution," as recited in claim 1 (amended). This newly added limitation was not claimed originally.

However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. It is obvious for the plurality of display apparatuses of Shiuan et al. to be adjusted at a desired resolution.

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2629

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Afroza Y. Chowdhury whose telephone number is 571-270-1543. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00 EST, 5/4/9.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amare Mengistu can be reached on 571-272-7674. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AC
10/26/2007


AMARE MENGISTU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER